DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 217 SP 034 176

TITLE Realizing Teacher Reform: A State Action Plan for Developing the Profession.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Boards of Education, Alexandria, VA.
PUB DATE [Oct 90]
NOTE 47p.; Recommendations made by the Study Group on Teaching of the National Association of School Boards of Education.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Incentives; *Minority Group Teachers; *Policy Formation; State Boards of Education; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS National Association of State Boards of Education

ABSTRACT

This report explores what state boards of education can do to enhance the performance of classroom teachers, and it looks at those areas within the teaching profession that are ripe for improvement. The document focuses on four main areas upon which state boards of education have direct impact: (1) revamping policies and regulations for teacher training programs, making them less prescriptive and more outcome-based; (2) revising teacher licensure and certification by developing a tiered system which distinguishes between initial or provisional and professional competencies; (3) differentiating among teachers in their work and pay by restructuring incentives and placing new importance on accountability systems; and (4) bolstering the minority teaching force by removing policies and practices that discourage qualified minority candidates from entering and remaining in the teaching profession. (Contains 50 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

5848

ED353217

Realizing Teacher Reform: A State Action Plan for Developing the Profession

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Kyselka

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

National Association of State Boards of Education

SP034176

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Realizing Teacher Reform: A State Action Plan for Developing the Profession

National Association of State Boards of Education

STUDY GROUP MEMBERS

Thomas Howerton, Colorado, Chair

Timothy Emert, Kansas

Darlene Hutchinson, Utah

Jackie Jarrett, South Dakota

Anne Larkin, Massachusetts

Hollis Lathem, Georgia

Charles Leopold, South Carolina

Teena Smith Little, North Carolina

James MacCallum, West Virginia

Marjorie Murray Medd, Maine

Brad Pigott, Mississippi

William Ramsey, Nebraska

Forest Reece, Oklahoma

Katherine Startin, Indiana

William Smith, Pennsylvania

Sue Wilken, Alaska

NASBE STAFF

Virginia Roach

Patrick Farrell

Editor: David Kysilko

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 1

Foreword 4

Background 5

Teacher Preparation 10

Teacher Licensure and Certification 16

The Work Environment of Practicing Teachers 23

Conclusion 35

References 36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Education Summit, called by President Bush late in 1989, focused on developing national goals to ensure a high level of education for all children. The NASBE Study Group on Teaching lauds the nation's aspirations for education and is proud of the educational accomplishments of many states and local districts. But as everyone knows, there is much work to be done in many areas if we are to achieve these lofty national goals, and one of the most critical is ensuring that students have the best possible teachers in our classrooms. This report, while acknowledging the fine work of many teachers in classrooms across the country, looks at those areas within the teaching profession that are ripe for improvement — and at how state policies and regulations can be used to help bring about needed changes.

During its year of deliberation, the Study Group focused on four main aspects of the teaching profession: teacher preparation, teacher licensure and certification, the work environment of practicing teachers, and the minority teaching force. After a lengthy process that included analyzing background and research literature, listening to experts in the field, and reviewing the experiences of states represented by study group members, the NASBE Study Group on Teaching developed the following primary recommendations to state boards of education. State boards should:

1. Improve Teacher Preparation by :

a. Revamping policies and regulations for teacher training programs to make them less prescriptive and more outcome-based and to ensure that they correspond to state expectations for K-12 education.

b. Encouraging or requiring that students in teacher training programs have extended and varied clinical experiences, and ensuring that teaching professors regularly spend time in public school classrooms.

2. Revise Teacher Licensure and Certification by :

a. Developing a tiered system of licensure or certification. Such a system should make a clear distinction between the competencies necessary to obtain an initial, provisional license or certificate and the competencies needed to obtain a professional license or certificate.

b. Setting into place alternative licensure routes for candidates entering teaching from other fields

c. Appointing an advisory board to counsel the state board on matters of teacher licensure and certification.

3. Differentiate among Teachers in Their Work and Pay by:

a. Restructuring the incentives employed to promote good teaching and the definition of the master teacher. These efforts should include experimenting with career ladders and differentiated pay systems.

b. Placing a new importance on the accountability systems used to assess teachers, and encouraging districts to experiment with peer evaluation of teacher performance, particularly for professional development purposes.

c. Recognizing the value of and promoting professional development programs that are designed by teachers and administered by local districts and schools.

4. Bolster the Minority Teaching Force by:

a. Examining state board policies and practices to assess their impact on the production of minority teachers. State boards should develop a process for removing those policies that discourage qualified minority candidates from entering the teaching profession and remaining in the classroom.

b. Providing incentives for greater coordination between two- and four-year colleges as a way to enhance minority recruitment.

These recommendations require a comprehensive effort on the part of state boards of education to set a new course for the development of the teaching profession. Yet along with their endorsement and actions, state boards can also play a critical role in garnering the support from other key policymakers at the state level that will be needed in order to fully implement these recommendations.

FOREWORD

Teaching is a complex, intellectual process and, as the 1987 NASBE Study Group on Teaching pointed out, there is a "wide range of policies, regulations, and funding issues which influence the working conditions and morale of teachers."

In 1989, the NASBE Board of Directors set as one of its five priorities the goal of helping states develop policies to "attract and retain the best educators for active learning environments." In keeping with this priority, NASBE President Phil Swain appointed the current NASBE Study Group on Teaching, comprised of 17 state board of education members from across the country.

The work of the 1987 Teaching Study Group focused on discussing the implications for state boards of education of the major policy reports on teaching, such as the Holmes and Carnegie reports, which had just been published. That study group raised important issues that laid the groundwork for further discussion in this area. This year's study group is working from the 1987 report to explore more specifically what state boards can do to enhance the performance of classroom teachers, in light of new knowledge about teaching that has emerged because of the attention paid to the teaching profession in the past five years. This year's report focuses on four main areas upon which state boards have a direct impact: teacher preparation, teacher licensure and certification, the work environment of practicing teachers, and minority participation in the teaching force.

BACKGROUND

In most states, state boards essentially control who enters the teaching profession, who is trained, and the type of training they receive. **The emerging challenge for state boards is to establish a vision for the future of education in their states, to restructure teacher policy accordingly and to work with other institutions and organizations to enhance the profession of teaching.**

State policymakers are now focusing on the educational needs of students who will be in school in the 21st century. As these students grow up in an ever more complex society, it will become increasingly important for them to be able to continue learning after they leave school, to adapt to change, and to creatively solve new problems. The abilities to think analytically and strategically and to communicate ideas will be needed by more and more workers.

But numerous reports, including those by previous NASBE study groups, have pointed out that we are not now graduating enough students with these abilities, and that fundamental changes throughout the education system are required to turn this around. These changes include, among others, covering fewer subjects in greater depth, integrating material across different subject areas, and adapting instruction to individual student needs. Classroom instruction can no longer proceed using the "factory" model of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in which all students progress through the curriculum in a lock-step fashion based on their age; rather, it must be individualized and varied to ensure success for each student.

Fortunately, many states and local school districts are now making serious efforts to restructure their schools to better serve a student population that is growing in its diversity and special needs. The Study Group believes that **upgrading and "retooling" the teaching force is an essential element of this comprehensive restructuring effort.**

We feel that the following teacher characteristics, taken largely from the 1989 report of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession, should serve as a guide to state boards as they promote and develop the teaching force that will complement the other facets of the restructuring effort.

Teachers should:

o act on the belief that all students can learn;

o understand how students develop and learn socially and emtionally as well as intellectually;

o have a deep understanding of the subjects they teach and understand how to teach those subjects to students;

o utilize technology, in both their own training and when they work with students;

o understand how to motivate students to learn and how to maintain their interest even in the face of temporary failure;

o employ multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding;

o be able to draw upon the resources at their disposal to complement their own knowledge and expertise;

o communicate effectively and work collaboratively with parents, engaging them productively in the work of the school; and

o exemplify the virtues they seek to inspire in students — curiosity, tolerance, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity and appreciation of cultural differences — and demonstrate the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual growth: the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives, to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.

These characteristics are the premises upon which this report's recommendations are based. We believe that every teacher should strive to master those qualities listed above. The challenge to state boards of education is to structure the policy environment at the state level so that it encourages teachers to become masters of their profession.

Many current state policies regarding teacher preparation, licensure and certification, professional development, and pay are at odds with the development of the qualities listed above. State boards can substantially upgrade the teaching profession by focusing on these four policy areas. At the same time, state boards must recognize that the lack of minority representation in the teaching force has reached crisis proportions. While state board policies aimed at upgrading the teaching profession should also help attract and retain more minority teaching candidates, truly meeting the challenge of increasing minority representation will require specific, targeted activities by state-level policymakers.

Fortunately, policymakers currently have a window of opportunity to improve the teaching force. First, according to a prediction by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, the number of new teachers hired annually will reach 215,000 by 1992 — up from 115,000 new teachers in 1981. This offers state boards a substantial opportunity to bring the advances and insights of educational reform to a significant number of new teachers. Second, state policymakers have already embarked on a course of restructuring education for students and schools. This will make it easier to extend that reform effort to teacher preparation, licensure, certification and in-service development, and will increase the probability of creating true, systemic change in the way schools are organized and operated. Finally, as a result of the national goals established by the nation's governors and the President, public attention is even more directed toward education, which may impel state policymakers to enact policies that will lead to substantial change in the current educational system — including the teaching force.

Policymaking for Reform

Over 1000 pieces of legislation regarding teachers were developed during the 1980s, and many of these policy proposals are now being implemented. Yet, studies indicate that the policies developed during the recent "wave" of educational reform, which mandate improvement in teacher and student performance, have actually had only a marginal impact on the quality of classroom instruction. A recent report released by the National Assessment of Educational Progress revealed that although students aged 9 and 17 were reading "better in 1988 than their counterparts tested in 1971," most of that improvement occurred in the 1970s, before the decade of educational reform. And there has been virtually no progress in writing performance by students in grades 4, 8, and 11. Thus, it would appear that the majority of strategies incorporated thus far have been inadequate and perhaps even inappropriate tools for improving education.

Complicating this picture has been the increased tendency to regulate the instructional process. As various reform strategies have been attempted and failed, the public has become more frustrated and policymakers have responded by placing further restrictions on the discretion of teachers and the institutions that train them. Onerous regulation can reduce opportunities for innovation and change, while driving the more imaginative and enterprising educators from the field. The close regulation of teacher training programs, for example, has created a disincentive for schools, colleges and departments of education to change the manner in which they train teachers and has alienated many deans and professors of education.

These efforts to regulate every facet of teaching ignore its inherent complexity. A more subtle approach, cognizant of the different areas of teacher competency, is needed. For example, some aspects of teacher assessment lend themselves to "outcome-based" evaluation. Outcome-based evaluations measure teachers against a predetermined performance standard, using standardized examinations and observation protocols. Outcome-based evaluations also serve, indirectly, as a means of judging the

teacher training programs from which those who are tested emerged.

Obviously, though, not all areas of teacher competency lend themselves to outcome-based evaluation. Those areas that are most amenable to outcome-based evaluation are those that can be easily quantified, such as communications skills, understanding of subject matter, and understanding of child development theory.

Other areas, such as ability to motivate students to learn, and ability to teach and convey a given subject matter, are more difficult to evaluate objectively. Those areas, where teacher competencies are more situation-specific and individually developed, we feel may be best addressed through "process" or "input" policies, which focus on improvements in the process and input in teacher training.

Finally, a recent study conducted by the Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) revealed that "[r]eforms adopted by most states lacked coherence." These independent reforms have tended to send a "barrage of signals to schools and districts without setting clear priorities." Similarly, educators who train teachers say that they are frustrated with the myriad of requirements, regulations and rules enacted by disparate governing bodies with which they are forced to comply. Since state legislatures, state boards of higher education and state boards of education (K-12) all can and do shape teacher preparation and teacher development requirements, teacher policies are generally not coordinated at the state level.

Teacher policies for the 21st century must be based on a cohesive combination of "process" and "outcomes" measures of teacher success.

I. TEACHER PREPARATION

Many teacher education programs are still following the dictates of an earlier era, and emphasize basic skills, classroom management and didactic instruction. Too many teacher candidates are taught to lecture students, use the chalkboard and impart knowledge one subject at a time.

Many observers of the education system feel teacher preparation programs are inadequate. They believe teacher education needs to be more intellectually challenging, especially in elementary education programs, where students receive an exposure to several subject areas but do not study any one area in depth. Education students typically take an array of courses from liberal arts professors who do not normally communicate with one another about teacher education, and who do not regularly communicate with education professors about teacher education. This leaves a wide margin for substantial gaps in teacher candidates' instruction. Further, according to the Holmes Group, education majors have few opportunities to develop "a sense of intellectual structure and [the] boundaries of the discipline."

Far too many teacher training programs have not retooled to meet the expectations of the professionalism movement. Teacher colleges are often organized into departments that are not encouraged to interact. As a result, improving teacher education often translates into improving the pedagogy within a particular discipline instead of developing teaching techniques that integrate the curriculum across different subject areas.

Teaching students often fail to get enough practical classroom experience. Clinical teaching sites are often chosen for convenience rather than for the quality of the practicum, and too commonly the differences between school practice and university preparation are ignored.

Education professors are not rewarded for refreshing their own classroom experience. Teacher educators are therefore often described as unconnected to the classroom, and hence not

in a position to help teachers prepare for the real challenges that they will face in their first positions. Teachers often describe the pedagogical aspects of their training programs as "weak" or "poor." Education professors are typically hired based on their academic expertise, research and publication background, with little concern for their teaching abilities.

Recommendations for Improving Teacher Preparation

Carefully preparing teaching candidates in a new philosophy of education is one important way to upgrade the teaching profession. By focusing on the entering teacher, policymakers and teacher trainers can create a new ethos for the profession that is bolstered each year by another new class of entering teachers.

A. Policies and regulations for teacher training programs should be less prescriptive in terms of specific course requirements and more outcome-based, and those outcomes should relate to the state board's goals for K-12 education.

Just as state policymakers are developing outcome measures for schools and students, they should begin to evaluate teacher training programs based on desired outcomes. New expectations for teacher work should be established and training programs evaluated accordingly.

o State boards should evaluate the quality of the teachers graduating from each teacher training program based on stated outcomes. This could be accomplished, in part, through an assessment prior to graduation for teacher candidates. Such an assessment should test candidates on basic skills of communication, specific subject matter, and how to teach that subject.

The new National Teachers Exam (NTE) could be used for this purpose, as could many state-developed tests that clearly assess

candidates' academic preparation. Other ways to evaluate graduating teachers include: in-class observations, clinical teaching demonstrations in special lab classrooms, and a review of candidates' work in lesson planning and curriculum development. When appropriate, state boards should be prepared to deny approval — and funding — to programs that consistently graduate an unacceptable number of inadequately prepared teachers.

Through its newly revised testing system, the Educational Testing Service is attempting to refocus part of its NTE assessment (formerly known as the National Teacher Examinations) on diagnosing candidate deficits in basic skills and helping them remediate those skills. There are three major components to the basic skills assessment: a decision test, an instructional package to prepare students to take the decision test, and a practice test that will indicate whether a candidate is ready to take the decision test. The new program is designed to promote access to the teaching profession by providing computer-based diagnostic and instructional assistance to students preparing for the basic skills portion of the NTE. The new NTE will be available in the fall of 1992.

o State boards should reward and showcase those programs that graduate a high percentage of well-qualified prospective teachers.

Teacher training programs are being buffeted by a barrage of criticism for their apparent resistance to reform. Although much of the criticism is warranted, criticism alone can lead to a defensive posture by schools, colleges and departments of education rather than leading to change. State boards should provide leadership in promoting those training programs that are embracing change and producing well prepared teachers.

B. While becoming relatively less prescriptive, state boards should encourage those aspects of teacher training programs that (1) reflect the needs of the current student and teacher population and (2) help to develop those qualities the Study Group identified as the hallmark of a master teacher.

Program elements to meet the new professionalism movement should include the types of institutional and organizational analysis that are necessary for site-based decision making and team teaching in restructured schools. Other attributes that state boards should be looking for in teacher training programs include: promoting multicultural awareness and teaching techniques for multicultural student populations; promoting diversified teaching practices and coordination among professors that help ensure all teaching candidates learn the curriculum in both their subject area and in the science of teaching; promoting experiential learning and school-based teaching experiences for candidates; and creating transition programs that ease the transition from student to teacher.

o State boards should require extended and varied clinical experiences for teacher candidates.

The type of district that a teacher will be working in — urban, suburban or rural — is rarely a factor for consideration in state licensure. Furthermore, teachers are typically licensed to work with either a variety of types of students in a given subject area or on a variety of subject areas within a given span of grade levels. Given all of the possible classroom situations that a particular license may entitle a teacher to work in, state boards should promote expanding the number and types of classrooms that a teacher candidate is exposed to during pre-service training.

One of the most efficient ways to do this is to require (through licensure requirements) extended and varied clinical experiences for teacher candidates where possible. Currently, 17 states require extended internships or induction periods. In addition, the majority of states require that teaching candidates complete

field work prior to student teaching. However, few states require that field work be varied across student populations or classroom situations.

States may also require varied clinical experiences through their program approval authority. Less than 20% of the institutions recently surveyed by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education required student teaching in urban schools, and only 5.7% of the surveyed schools mandated student teaching in schools with poor and disadvantaged students.

Earlier this year the Massachusetts State Board of Education approved new teacher-certification rules that include many of the attributes of this recommendation. Among other elements, the new rules stipulate that prospective teachers complete extensive and varied field experience.

The rules, in essence, abolish the undergraduate degree in education in Massachusetts and require that teacher candidates receive a "bachelor's degree with a liberal arts and sciences or appropriate interdisciplinary major." Each candidate, as of 1994, will be required to complete "a clinical experience in the role and at the level of the certificate sought" and a master's degree to achieve full certification.

o State boards should require that schools, colleges and departments of education ensure that professors who train teachers have regular exposure to actual classroom situations.

This may be accomplished through the professors' work in clinical practice schools or, alternatively, through regular teaching sabbaticals in the area in which they train teachers.

Clinical practice schools, proposed in 1986 by both the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, are modeled after teaching hospitals, and provide an environment that offers a "more structured and supportive introduction to teaching than now exists." Clinical practice schools, as proposed by the Holmes Group, are jointly operated by school districts and universities; in them, university professors not only observe novice teachers in the classroom but also demonstrate teaching techniques alongside the schools' master teachers. Hence, clinical practice schools can provide extended clinical experience and practice to student teachers and as well as ensure actual classroom exposure for professors of education.

State boards can establish channels of communication with university and college presidents and deans to promote regular teaching sabbaticals for education professors, and state boards can provide incentive programs for colleges and universities to promote such teaching sabbaticals. State boards can also encourage teaching college administrators to explore creating separate faculty positions for "clinical" and "research" professors.

II. TEACHER LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION

In other professions, initial certification or licensure is designed primarily as a minimum competency for public protection. Initial certification or licensure is therefore based primarily on a candidate's training, rather than on demonstrated proficiency in the field. Advanced certification or licensure renewal, on the other hand, is oriented toward "advanced levels of knowledge and skills," rather than merely "safe practice."

For the teaching profession, there is very little difference between initial and advanced licensure or certification. In many states licensure and certification standards define a set of courses that a candidate must complete before he or she is eligible to enter the classroom. Often permanent certification requirements focus on accumulating professional development courses. As a practical matter, this training may bring little real change in terms of actual student achievement, even though a teacher thus trained has, according to the state, achieved "an advanced level of skill and knowledge." Furthermore, although certification should, logically, be related to a teacher's classroom performance, evaluation for continuing certification rarely touches the classroom.

In most states, state boards of education establish licensure and certification requirements. In the past several years, however, there has been growing support for independent professional standards boards in states. As proposed, these boards, composed largely of teachers, would be primarily responsible for establishing licensure and certification requirements for teachers, granting those certificates, and making decisions regarding the revocation or suspension of certificates of practicing teachers.

Independent professional practice boards are narrowly focused by definition. Their relatively narrow focus might work against other state efforts to create flexibility in the system, a flexibility that is necessary in order to serve an increasingly

diverse student population with needs that have not been traditionally met in schools. [1] The creation of independent policy boards could further splinter the policymaking process at the state level, at a time when states are trying to create comprehensive, coordinated policies for restructured schools.

Recommendations for Teacher Licensure and Certification

Licensure and certification requirements convey the values of a state board of education regarding teacher training and, hence, the board's expectations for students. In this era of educational reform, teacher licensure and certification has taken on new importance and can no longer consist of mere transcript reviews.

A. State boards should develop a tiered system of certification and licensure which makes a clear distinction between the competencies necessary to obtain an initial, provisional certificate or licensure and the competencies needed to obtain a professional certificate or license.

o Teacher competencies develop along a continuum from the novice teacher to the master teacher. Licensure or certification policies should reflect that continuum.

Classroom experience develops teacher competency and, eventually, expertise. Initial licensure should depend primarily on academic proficiency, while advanced certification or licensure should turn on demonstrated proficiency in the classroom. This tiered system more accurately reflects the developmental stages teachers experience from the beginning of their careers to the point at which they reach a level of advanced expertise.

Teaching is a complex process and teacher professionalism (as with professionals in all fields) is, we feel, based on a continuum of developing expertise. Dr. David Berliner of Arizona State University has described the continuum in five stages: novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient and expert. While the novice teaches mainly by the rules learned through college

[1] Oregon, in fact, made provisions in its reform legislation that allow the state to bypass its independent licensure board when providing waivers that allow districts flexibility to experiment with innovative teaching strategies.

training, the expert evaluates the situation through "intuition" to make appropriate teaching responses. We recommend that state boards support and endorse the concept of teacher development along a continuum.

Regarding initial certification or licensure, state departments of education should centrally administer examinations to teachers who wish to become provisionally licensed to teach in the state. These examinations should test candidates' knowledge of specific subject matter, and should explore a candidate's understanding of child development, pedagogy, and the organization and governance of public education. This initial exam could be synonymous with the exit exam from teacher training programs. Initial, provisional licensure should be granted for a short period of time in order to allow a teacher to begin gaining classroom experience. Full, professional licensure should then be granted to teachers who pass a series of evaluations of teacher performance.

Connecticut's Education Enhancement Act of 1986 established a tiered system of licensure and certification. The first hurdle to entry into the teaching profession is a test of basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics that is also required for formal admittance into a teacher training program. The second hurdle is the CONNTENT examination, "which ensures that prospective teachers have the content knowledge critical to their subject specialization." The Initial Educator Certificate is granted to applicants who have passed both examinations, and is valid for one year.

During the teacher's first year in the classroom, he or she then participates in the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program, which "provides a combination of support and assessment for the beginning teacher." As part of this program, the beginning teacher is observed six separate times over the course of the first year by assessors who are selected through a state committee process and who undergo extensive training in the state's evaluation instrument. If a candidate receives passing ratings on these observations, then he or she receives a Provisional Certificate valid for eight years.

In keeping with Connecticut's model provided in the box above, advanced certification should be more closely linked to teacher performance. Teacher performance can be assessed in a number of ways, including in-class observations, reviewing portfolios of teacher and student work, and evaluating mock teaching sessions constructed in teacher centers. These types of evaluations are best performed locally by teams of educators trained by the state. Also, we feel that this phase of evaluation should include classroom teachers evaluating their peers.

The Study Group believes that continuing certification, after full certification is achieved, should be linked to professional development, but that the definition of professional development must be expanded beyond its current definition. (See Recommendation "c" under "Recommendations for Differentiating Teacher Work and Teacher Pay.")

When revamping certification systems, based on new criteria, state boards could benefit by drawing upon the insight and experience of independent organizations that are seeking to develop certification credentials for highly qualified teachers in specific areas. Those organizations include the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Science Teachers Association and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was established in 1987 to develop teaching certification standards and assessment processes. Designed to complement state licensure systems, Board certification is offered as a vehicle for upgrading the teaching profession. Rather than issuing one certificate, suggesting that the holder is capable of teaching "all subjects to all children of all ages," Board certification — which is still under development — will be in specific areas, much like current state licensure systems. In keeping with the Board's philosophy that teaching is an intricate and context-specific process, the Board anticipates that assessment "will consist of a variety of methods, including some that may require assessment centers and others that might involve assessment of on-site performance."

State boards may wish to adopt the National Board's certification standards as part of the continuing certification standards in their states. National certification, as proposed, is attractive because unlike many current state certification programs, it is based on teacher performance rather than solely on teacher knowledge. **State boards should be cognizant, though, that by adopting National Board Certification standards they would be ceding a certain measure of direction and control to a private, independent organization.**

o State boards should appoint an advisory board to advise the state board on matters of teacher licensure and certification. These advisory boards should be directed by and report to the state board, as it is essential that teacher licensure and certification be closely integrated with the other aspects of education over which state boards of education have authority, such as student and school performance, educational priorities for the state, and issues related to student equity and multicultural education.

State boards should be looking to such professional practice boards to develop assessments that evaluate teachers' classroom performance instead of simply reviewing the college courses

teachers and teacher candidates have completed. This will require a more labor-intensive process of assessment than has been used in the past. In this respect, professional standards commissions and certification and licensing divisions in state departments of education will necessarily expand and take on new importance. However, their efforts must be closely coordinated with the other efforts of state boards of education and state departments of education to implement a new, comprehensive vision of education for the 21st century.

As teacher licensure and certification become more sophisticated, relying on more complex forms of evaluation and performance outcomes instead of preparation requirements, it becomes even more important that licensure is coordinated with student expectations. The work of professional practice commissions that report to state boards can be integrated with the other work of the state board of education and department of education. This ensures coordination between teacher licensure and certification and expectations for students. State boards work to ensure adequate working conditions, competitive salaries, innovative management strategies and the flexibility needed at the local level to allow teachers to do their work. They can integrate licensure requirements with these other areas.

Currently, Vermont, Connecticut, Nevada and Maryland have professional practice boards or commissions that either advise the state board of education or establish policies over which the state board of education has veto power.

B. State boards should continue to explore and promote alternative licensure routes for candidates entering teaching from other fields.

o State boards should provide incentives for people to enter the profession from other fields — particularly in areas of teacher shortages — as well as incentives for paraprofessionals to become fully licensed teachers.

Alternative licensure programs have been instituted in 29 states.

For many states, alternative certification routes are seen as a way to attract more minorities into the teaching profession. Other states, while recognizing the potential for attracting minority candidates, are hoping that alternative certification routes will also help to replenish the supply of teachers in specific subject areas such as math and science.

State boards should provide support for teacher candidates entering the profession through other fields. Alternative licensure programs should not be substandard courses that assume that because the candidate already knows a great deal about a particular field that he or she knows about teaching in that field. Alternative route teachers need as much direction regarding classroom instruction as novices completing an undergraduate degree in education. Alternative licensure requirements, therefore, should include a period of supervised student teaching. Currently, only 13 states that have alternative routes to certification have such a provision.

Because new teachers, licensed through alternative routes, may have had very little exposure to the classroom prior to their student teaching experience, states should also require extended induction programs for these new teachers. Currently 19 states require extended internship or induction programs, and 9 of those are states that also require supervised student teaching experiences for alternative route teaching candidates. Many of the teachers entering the profession through alternate routes are switching careers. Therefore, internships and induction programs should be paid positions in which the novice teacher receives assistance from a more experienced teacher.

III. THE WORK ENVIRONMENT OF PRACTICING TEACHERS

A. Professional Development and Evaluation

In-service and professional development requirements are closely linked to continuing certification requirements in many states. Many states have increased in-service requirements for teachers while abandoning life-time certification. However, those requirements may have little impact on teacher performance.

Research has shown that the most effective teacher training is locally developed and tailored to the needs of the particular teachers in a given school. Yet many state departments of education evaluate their effectiveness in terms of the amount of "in-service" they can provide to teachers around the state. This leads to what has been termed a "round 'em up and train 'em" mentality on the part of many state department personnel. Such in-service training is often characterized as "one-shot, dog-and-pony shows" in which teachers receive information in a vacuum with no follow-up or coordination with other development efforts. As long as state departments of education define their professional development responsibilities in terms of numbers of teachers trained, this method of in-service will flourish.

Many states have fallen into a trap of investing in a particular method of staff development or classroom practice that later proves ineffective. For example, some states have bought into evaluation protocols that are based on teaching schemes developed and marketed as part of comprehensive staff development packages, only to find out later that the particular package was not research-based. After investing heavily in a given program, however, states and districts may not be able to change course to employ more effective methods of professional development and evaluation. As a result, a given state's professional development program may lag far behind recent advances in research regarding professional development and teacher training.

B. Reward and Incentive Systems

Reward and incentive systems for teachers to improve effectiveness in the classroom or to teach at-risk students are practically nonexistent in the teaching profession. New teachers are often placed with the most challenging classes, while veteran teachers request and receive transfers to work in the schools with the lowest number of student problems. Furthermore, compensation in most states and districts is fixed through a lock-step payment scale that tallies only years of experience and the number of graduate credits that a teacher has completed. These indicators do not necessarily relate to the effectiveness of a classroom teacher.

Recommendations for Differentiating Teacher Work and Teacher Pay

A. State boards must take an active role in restructuring the incentives employed to promote good teaching and the definition of the master teacher.

o State boards should define the expert teacher as one who is capable of handling the most difficult teaching situations. Therefore, state boards of education should provide incentives to local districts to assign the best teachers to work with the students most at-risk of school failure. One way to do this is to establish clinical practice schools or "teaching schools" in the schools that serve at-risk students, staffing those schools with master teachers and university faculty to train new teachers.

Another method is through rewarding teachers monetarily, through salary supplements on the state teaching scale, for working with "at-risk" students, similar to the reform effort in Rochester, New York begun in 1987. Under the landmark teacher's contract that was negotiated between the Rochester Teachers Association and the school district, "lead teachers" — recognized as the master teachers of the district — are able to earn up to $70,000 a year if

they agree to accept teaching positions wherever they are needed in the district. Generally, teacher assignments are based on the premise that the best teachers "ought to get the toughest assignments, on the assumption that if they can't do it, it can't be done." This agreement diminishes the importance of seniority as the determining factor in voluntary-transfer requests.

o State boards should continue to experiment with differentiated pay systems rather than paying teachers solely on the basis of years of experience and the number of graduate credits earned.

In 1983, the Utah Legislature adopted a state-wide teacher Career Ladder System that has four major components: the Extended Contract Year, Job Enlargement, Performance Bonus, and Career Ladder Levels. The Extended Contract Year buys more professional teacher time beyond the regular contract year to enable all teachers to perform work that they normally try to squeeze into their regular schedule. Job Enlargement allows districts to pay teachers for short-term activities such as mentoring other teachers and developing curriculum. The Performance Bonus pays bonuses to teachers rated as the best in the school or district. Career Ladder Levels create a structure through which teachers may advance in status, work responsibilities, and pay.

Each district submits a Career Ladder Plan to be approved by the state. Starting in 1990, the Utah State Office of Education will provide districts with technical assistance and incentives to develop Career Ladder Plans that explicitly promote student-focused education and multi-year plans to encourage districts to engage in a long range planning process.

In general, pay systems based on job enlargement, that compensate teachers for different types of work rather than superior performance evaluations, seem to be the most acceptable to teachers, and thus the most successful. And, differentiating teacher work in this manner helps to alleviate "teacher burnout," as teachers would have an opportunity to vary their instructional roles and work in collaboration with other educators rather than in isolation.

B. State boards must place a new importance on the accountability systems used with teachers. Evaluating teacher performance is complex, and state boards should discourage the use of evaluation procedures that rely on a single classroom observation check list. State boards should encourage the use of multiple evaluation techniques to assess the performance of a given teacher.

One current effort to improve teacher evaluation is the Teacher Assessment Project, directed by Dr. Lee Shulman of Stanford University. Dedicated to "expanding the vision of those who design tests for teachers," Dr. Shulman imagines teacher assessment as an "ongoing set of at least the following procedures:

o written assessments;

o simulation exercises performed at an assessment center;

o documentation of performance during supervised field experiences; and

o direct observation of practice by trained observers."

Dr. Shulman maintains that current forms of assessment ignore the context in which effective instruction takes place, and that assessment that follows his strategy can "help socialize beginning and experienced teachers to new collegial roles and stimulate new configurations of relationships at the school site."

o Teacher evaluation for employment should be clearly distinguished from evaluation for improvement purposes. At the same time, state boards should encourage districts to experiment with peer evaluation by teachers, particularly with evaluation for professional improvement.

School principals operate as both the instructional leaders and building managers of the schools in which they work. Consequently, a principal is pulled in several directions at one time, and the principal's role in teacher evaluation is no different. Teacher evaluation often places the administrator in a position in which he or she is at once evaluating a teacher for purposes of professional development as well as employment. Given the two competing objectives of the typical evaluation, evaluation for professional development purposes often is forgotten in favor of evaluation for employment. Because of this, teacher evaluation for professional development should not rest solely with building administrators, who often have inadequate resources and time to assist with professional development in a meaningful way.

In the past, teachers have been generally resistant to peer evaluation schemes. This is primarily because such evaluations are typically used solely for determining employment rather than assisting teachers in professional development and improvement. This need not be the case, however, as the Salt Lake City School District has shown in its successful teacher evaluation system that includes peer evaluation and assistance for deficient teachers.

The Salt Lake City teacher evaluation system, called "Performance Assistance," is a multi-level process that begins with each teacher developing an Accountability Plan in consultation with her building principal. This plan includes goals and objectives set by the district and the teacher's school. If the principal determines that a teacher is not meeting goals of the plan or needs assistance, the teacher is given Informal Performance Assistance. If the teacher fails to improve, the principal can refer her to Formal Remediation.

In Formal Remediation, the teacher works with a four-person team, comprised of a learning specialist, the principal, a coordinator from the Salt Lake Teacher's Association and a grade/subject-specific assisting teacher. The team develops an improvement and performance assistance plan with the teacher. The plan for performance assistance includes periodic reviews of the teacher by all team members. If after this intervention the teacher's performance improves, the Performance Assistance is discontinued. If, however, the teacher is still deemed inadequate after five months of intervention and review, the teacher is recommended for either termination or reassignment.

During the first nine years of operation, 70 teachers went through the Formal Remediation process, and of those, 33 were judged to be successfully remediated and returned to their normal classroom. The remaining teachers were either transferred, dismissed or retired.

An overwhelming majority of peer evaluators have found the process to be fair. Peer evaluators respond that the process helped them reflect upon their own teaching. The high level of teacher acceptance of this process is attributed, in part, to the organizational context in which evaluations occur and the teacher involvement in the design and implementation of the system. The Salt Lake City Schools model is proof that peer evaluation can work if it is approached in the correct manner.

C. State boards should recognize the value of and promote professional development programs that are designed by teachers.

Professional development opportunities should stimulate growth in developing the qualities of a master teacher through self-examination and improvement. State boards should direct their state departments of education to redefine in-service training programs to primarily provide funds and technical assistance to local districts and schools to conduct their own comprehensive professional development programs.

o Professional development plans should be developed by each teacher, in consultation with the building-level management team. State boards should approve a wider range of professional development activities than most states currently do.

Professional development should vary according to developmental and experiential stages. Activities that could be acceptable as state approved "professional development" include:

- meetings where professional concerns are discussed
- participation in working groups
- attendance at workshops/institutes or university courses where one "listens to the experts"
- serving as a mentor teacher
- individual development as determined by each teacher's self-examination
- observing peers in the classroom and teachers in other schools

Consequently, state boards should recognize professional development provided by a range of professionals including: professors at institutions of higher education, practitioners, "master" teachers, consultants, and state education agency staff.

o **Professional development should also support state-, district- and building-level educational goals. Therefore, each teacher's individual development plan should be evaluated on the extent that it incorporates the institutional goals established by state and local boards of education and building-level management teams.**

State boards have several options for encouraging this type of professional development. For example, they may require districts to submit professional development plans. State Boards could provide money and release time for a team of teachers from each district to develop district and school professional development plans. State boards can also direct departments of education to provide guidelines and technical assistance to districts to teach them how to develop professional development plans. And, state boards could require a certain level of professional development for districts to receive accreditation and/or for teachers to be recertified.

In 1989 the Pennsylvania State Board of Education released its Report on Teacher Preparation, Certification and Professional Development. The report states that "once permanent certification is attained, organized efforts to address the continuing needs of professionals to renew and rededicate should not cease." The following recommendations from the report will be considered by the Pennsylvania State Board as they review their school codes for teacher preparation and certification:

RECOMMENDATION #28: Individualized programs of continuing professional development should be developed for all teachers. Classroom teachers should take the lead in developing these training plans, which should include appropriate experiences in graduate studies, in-service programs, and professional conferences.

RECOMMENDATION #30: Because of the importance of continuing development to the professional vitality of the teacher and our schools, professional development should be integral to evaluation systems for teachers and other school personnel at all stages of their careers.

IV. MINORITY TEACHING FORCE

Today, approximately ten percent of the teaching force is a member of a minority group, while children of racial and ethnic minorities comprise roughly twenty percent of the overall school-aged population. Unfortunately, as we approach the twenty-first century this gap is expected to widen: in ten years it is likely that only 5% of teachers will be minority, while one-third of the students will be members of a minority group.

The minority teacher shortage is largely a systemic problem relating to the poor quality of education for minority students in general. It is due, in part, to poor educational experiences in the elementary and secondary grades that lead to disproportionately high dropout rates among minority students. Further, since a disproportionately high number of minority students are tracked into vocational programs, a disproportionately low number of minority students are prepared to pursue higher education. The shortage of minority teachers is also partially due to inadequate recruitment and support efforts for minority students on the part of institutions of higher education. Finally, the shortage can be attributed in part to the testing policies enacted in the 1980s that merely screened out high numbers of minority teacher candidates, rather than helping those candidates succeed in the system. These trends, if not reversed, will lead to appallingly low numbers of minority teachers for a student population that is projected to be 39% minority by 2020.

Recommendations for Recruiting Minority Teachers

A. State boards and state departments of education should examine their policies and practices to determine their effect on the production of minority teachers.

States should establish a process for reviewing all policies to determine how they impact minority teaching candidates and minority teachers. We encourage each state board to undertake this process in order to better understand the dynamics

of the problem in their state. State boards should develop a process for removing those policies that discourage qualified minority candidates from entering the teaching profession and remaining in the classroom.

The department of education in each state should take the lead in this review; however, the department should actively solicit input from representatives of the education and minority communities, including input from minority parents, students, teachers and administrators as well as from advocacy groups such as the NAACP, Urban League and La Raza. States should also invite comment from other representatives of minority populations, such as prominent clergymen, tribal elders and locally elected minority politicians. States should further consult experts who specialize in minority education, such as Eleanor McMahon at Brown University and Norman Francis at Xavier University of Louisiana.

B. State boards should provide incentives for greater coordination between two- and four-year colleges as a way to enhance minority recruitment.

A larger proportion of minority students enroll in two-year colleges than in four-year colleges. Yet minorities in two-year colleges are often counseled into narrow, vocational training that all but precludes these students from pursuing the four-year degree that is a prerequisite to a teaching certificate. Many four-year colleges do not perceive a need to coordinate with two-year colleges to ensure a supply of minority teacher candidates. Or, alternatively, four-year colleges have limited their recruiting efforts, focusing on easing transfer and registration requirements from two- to four-year colleges for students already on an academic track.

Efforts should focus on more than financial assistance and transferring minority teacher candidates from two-year colleges to four-year colleges (although these too are very important). Four-year colleges should work with two-year colleges to counsel students into rigorous, academic programs. Both four-

year and two-year colleges should focus on providing support programs for minority students so that the students feel accepted on the higher education campus. This may be accomplished through the use of incentive funds for special projects promoting minority teacher recruitment.

As reported by the Education Commission of the States, "[t]he New York State Education Department is working with public and private two- and four-year institutions to jointly plan teacher education programs. Under the plan, minority students will begin the teacher preparation program at the community college and continue the program at the four-year institution. California has considered legislation to establish partnerships among schools, colleges and departments of education to provide academic support to minority students interested in teaching."

CONCLUSION

Setting policies for the teaching profession is one of the most important roles state boards of education have. Attracting, training and retaining the best teachers is of vital importance to any efforts aimed at improving education.

The recommendations put forward in this report will require a comprehensive effort on the part of state boards of education to set a course for the development of the teaching profession. Along with state board endorsement, these recommendations will need support from many other key policy actors at the state level in order to be put into effect. State boards should be particularly cognizant of the lobbying efforts they will have to conduct with the legislature in order to increase financial support to implement the recommendations. Finally, the support and input of teacher training institutions and of teachers themselves will be needed to move this agenda forward in each state.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Kern and Monk, David H., editors (1987). Attracting and Compensating America's Teachers. Eighth Annual Yearbook of the American Education Finance Association. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing.

The Alliance of Leaders for Minority Teachers (1990). New Strategies for Producing Minority Teachers. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

———— (1990). New Strategies for Producing Minority Teachers: Programs and Plans. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Alston, Denise A. (November 9, 1987). "Recruiting Minority Classroom Teachers: A View of Fifteen States". Restructuring Schools Project, National Governors' Association, (draft).

Amsler, Mary; et al. " An Evaluation of the Utah Career System: Summary and Analysis of Policy Implications." (report by Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development for the Utah State Office of Education)

Benzley, Janet; Kauchak, Don; and Peterson, Ken (1985). "Peer Evaluation: An Interview Study of Teachers Evaluating Teachers." Department of Family and Consumer Studies and Department of Educational Studies, University of Utah. (paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association). Chicago.

Berliner, David C. (1988). The Development of Expertise in Pedagogy. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Bierly, M.B. and Berliner, D.C. (1982). "The Elementary School Teacher as Learner." Journal of Teacher Education. 33: 37-40.

Bradley, Ann (1990). "States Are Looking to Paraprofessionals As Promising Source of Minority Teachers." Education Week. 9:39 , 1,17.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession. Unpublished paper based on presentation given by Arthur Wise, Director, to the Education Policy Forum on April 27, 1990 in Washington, D.C.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Bureau of Teacher Certification. "How To Enter The Teaching Profession In Massachusetts If You Do Not Hold A Traditional Education Degree." (pamphlet)

———. "Restructured Teacher Preparation in Massachusetts — Requirements For Certification as of January 23, 1990." (document)

The Condition of Teaching: A State-by-State Analysis, 1988 (1988). Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Berry, Barnett (March, 1988). "The Evolution of Teacher Policy." Center for Policy Research in Education, RAND Corporation.

Eastern Oregon State College (March, 1988). Four Year Teacher Education Proposal.

Effective Accountability: Improving the Schools, Informing the Public (1988). Alexandria, Va.: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Estimates of School Statistics; 1988-89 (1989). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Firestone, William, and Bader, Beth H. (February 9, 1990). "Education Policy in New Jersey: Problems and Possibilities for a New Administration; New Roles for Teachers: Issues and Options." Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers-The State University.

Firestone, William A.; Fuhrman, Susan H.; and Kirst, Michael W. (1989). The Progress of Reform: An Appraisal of State Education Initiatives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Fowler, William J. Jr. (April, 1990). "Teacher Salaries: Comparing States After Adjusting for Teacher Experience and Education." National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association). Boston.

42 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grossman, Pamela L., and Richert, Anna E. (1986). "Unacknowledged Knowledge Growth: A Re-examination of the Effects of Teacher Education." (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association). San Francisco.

Mann, Dale (1986). "Authority and School Improvement: An Essay on 'Little King' Leadership." Teachers College Record, 88:1.

——— (1989). "Teacher networks are the first step in redesigning education's workplace." The American School Board Journal, 176:12.

Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States (1988). Sacramento, Ca.: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

The Metropolitan Life Survey of The American Teacher 1989: Preparing Schools for the 1990's (1989). New York: Louis Harris and Associates.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1990). NCATE Update, 10:1.

NTE Programs Newsletter (1990). 3:5.

Olson, Lynn (1989). "'Clinical Schools': Theory Meets Practice on the Training Ground." Education Week, 8:29.

Paying for Performance - Important Questions and Answers: The 1989 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Report (January, 1990). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Principles for National Recognition of State Approaches to Program Approval (April, 1987). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Procedures for National Recognition of State Approaches to Program Approval (July 1987). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Quality Education for Minorities Project (1990). Education That Works: An Action Plan for the Education of Minorities. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Report from NASBE Study Group on Teaching (October, 1987). Alexandria, Va.: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Rethinking Curriculum: A Call for Fundamental Reform; A Report of the National Association of State Boards of Education Curriculum Study Group (October, 1988). Alexandria, Va.: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Rosenholtz, Susan (1989). Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools. New York: Longman.

Rothman, Robert (1990). "NAEP Results in Reading, Writing Show Few Gains." Education Week, 9:17.

Shulman, Lee S. (1987) "Assessment for Teaching: An Initiative for the Profession." Phi Delta Kappan, 69:1.

Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units (1990). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

State Education Indicators, 1988 (1988). Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

State Education Indicators, 1989 (1989). Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

State of Connecticut, Department of Education (1988). "Connecticut Continuum: Connecticut's Commitment to the Teaching Profession." (pamphlet).

Status of the American Public School Teacher: 1985-86 (1987). Washington D.C.: National Education Association.

Study Team on Teacher Preparation (1989). "Report on Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Development." Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

Sykes, Gary (1983). "Contradictions, Ironies and Promises Unfulfilled: A Contemporary Account of the Status of Teaching." National Institute of Education.

Sykes, Gary, and Wilson, Suzanne M. (1988). Professional Standards for Teaching: The Assessment of Teacher Knowledge and Skill. Charleston, W. Va.: Policy and Planning Center at Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

36th Annual List of Accredited Programs/Units (1990). Washington D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group (1986). East Lansing, Mich.: The Holmes Group.

Toward High and Rigorous Standards for the Teaching Profession: Initial Policies and Perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1989). Washington D.C.: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1988). Youth Indicators 1988: Trends in the Well Being of American Youth. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Utah State Office of Education. "USOE Career Ladder Priorities" (paper describing the priorities for Career Ladder Plans for the Utah Office of Education).

Wise, A.E. and Darling-Hammond, L. (1985) "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism." Educational Leadership. 42:28-33.

CONSULTANTS TO THE STUDY GROUP

Joan Baratz-Snowden, Vice-President of Assessment and Research, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

David Berliner, Professor of Education, Arizona State University

Beth Bond, Program Manager for Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

Robert Chase, Vice-President, National Education Association

William Firestone, Senior Research Fellow, Center for Policy Research in Education

Donna Gollnick, Deputy Executive Director National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Dale Mann, Professor of Educational Administration, Teachers College, Columbia University

Arthur Wise, Director, Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession, RAND Corporation

The views expressed in this report do not necessarily coincide with positions taken by the educators listed above.

The National Association of State Boards of Education is a non-profit, private association that represents state and territorial boards of education. Our principal objectives are to strengthen state leadership in education policymaking; promote excellence in the education of all students; advocate equality of access to educational opportunity; and assure responsible lay governance of public education.

1012 Cameron Street Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 684-4000